

REMARKS

In the Final Office Action of August 5, 2008, claims 1-4, 6, 7, 10 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement because allegedly there is no support for the limitations of *“wherein the shield has a two-stepped structure in the extension area comprising a first step and a second step, the first step and the second step having a combined height shorter than a height of the gate electrode,”* as recited in claim 1. Claims 1-4, 6, 7, 10 and 12 were also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention.

The Office Action has also rejected claims 1-3, 10 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Number 2002/0102800 A1 (“Van Den Heuvel”), or in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Van Den Heuvel. In addition, claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 10 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,545,316 (“Baliga”), or in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Baliga. Furthermore, claims 1, 10 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Applicant Admitted Prior Art (“AAPA”), or in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over AAPA.

With respect to the Section 112, first paragraph, rejections, Applicants have canceled claim 12 and amended the independent claim 1 by removing the limitations of *“wherein the shield has a two-stepped structure in the extension area comprising a first step and a second step, the first step and the second step having a combined height shorter than a height of the gate electrode”* and adding the limitations of *“wherein the shield has a stepped structure in the extension area, the shield including an inverse L-shaped section and a z-shaped section, a top end of the z-shaped section being connected to a bottom end of the inverse L-shaped section.”* This claim

amendment is fully supported by the specification at least on page 5, lines 4-5 and lines 29-30, and by Fig. 2 of the present application. Thus, these rejections are no longer applicable. As such, Applicants respectfully request that the Section 112, first paragraph, rejections of claims 1-4, 6, 7 and 10 be withdrawn.

5

With respect to the Section 112, second paragraph, rejections, Applicants respectfully assert that these rejections are also no longer applicable because of the claim amendment of claim 1. As such, Applicants respectfully request that the Section 112, second paragraph, rejections of claims 1-4, 6, 7 and 10 be withdrawn.

10

With respect to Section 102 and 103 rejections of claims 1-4, 6, 7 and 10, Applicants respectfully assert that the amended independent claim 1 is neither anticipated by nor obvious over AAPA, Van Den Heuvel or Baliga, as explained below. In view of the claim amendments and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the pending claims 1-10 be allowed.

15

A. Patentability of Amended Independent Claim 1

As amended, the independent claim 1 recites in part “*wherein the shield has a stepped structure in the extension area, the shield including an inverse L-shaped section and a z-shaped section, a top end of the z-shaped section being connected to a bottom end of the inverse L-shaped section,*” which is not disclosed in AAPA, Van Den Heuvel or Baliga. Thus, the amended independent claim 1 is neither anticipated by nor obvious over AAPA, Van Den Heuvel or Baliga. As such, Applicants respectfully request that the amended independent claim 1 be allowed.

20

25

AAPA discloses an LDMOS transistor 99 having a shield 50, as illustrated in Fig. 1. However, the shield 50 of AAPA does not include “*an inverse L-shaped section and a z-shaped section, a top end of the z-shaped section being connected to a bottom end of the inverse L-shaped section,*” as recited in the amended independent claim 1. The cited reference of Van Den Heuvel discloses a semiconductor device

30

with a LDMOS transistor having a shielding electrode 27. However, this shielding electrode 27 also does not include “*an inverse L-shaped section and a z-shaped section, a top end of the z-shaped section being connected to a bottom end of the inverse L-shaped section,*” as recited in the amended independent claim 1. The cited reference of Baliga discloses a MOSFET device. However, the MOSFET device of Baliga does not have a shield including “*an inverse L-shaped section and a z-shaped section, a top end of the z-shaped section being connected to a bottom end of the inverse L-shaped section,*” as recited in the amended independent claim 1.

Since AAPA, Van Den Heuvel and Baliga do not disclose the claimed limitations of “*wherein the shield has a stepped structure in the extension area, the shield including an inverse L-shaped section and a z-shaped section, a top end of the z-shaped section being connected to a bottom end of the inverse L-shaped section,*” the amended independent claim 1 is neither anticipated by nor obvious over AAPA, Van Den Heuvel or Baliga. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the amended independent claim 1 be allowed.

B. Patentability of Dependent Claims 2-10

Each of the dependent claims 2-10 depends on the amended independent claim 1. As such, these dependent claims include all the limitations of the amended independent claim 1. Therefore, Applicants submit that these dependent claims are allowable for at least the same reasons as the amended independent claim 1.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claims in view of the remarks made herein. A notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
Theeuwes et al.

Date: October 6, 2008

By: /thomas h. ham/
Thomas H. Ham
Registration No. 43,654
Telephone: (925) 249-1300